DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 366 PS 007 876

AUTHOR Yawkey, Thomas Daniels
TITLE Play of the Young Child and Day Care Workers: A Piaget Justification.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Child Development; Creative Development; *Day Care Programs; *Early Childhood Education; Elementary School Students; Emotional Development; Intellectual Development; *Learning Theories; Motor Development; *Perceptual Motor Learning; *Play; Preschool Children; Preschool Curriculum; Social Development
IDENTIFIERS *Piaget (Jean); Symbolic Play

ABSTRACT

Coupled with justifications of nondescriptive and intuitive levels, research from Piaget's developmental theory is used to support play as a viable part of a day care curriculum. Within the context of Piaget's theory of play, three developmental stages or classifications of play are distinguished: (1) sensorimotor practice play (infants); (2) symbolic play (2 to 7 or 8 years of age); and (3) play activities with rules (7 to 11 or 12 years of age). A fourth level of play, constructive and creative play, which is neither successive nor hierarchical, is discussed within Piaget's schema as a "trasitional level." The advantages of using a rationale for play taken from developmental theory are listed; however, more research in this area is encouraged. (RD)

ED107366

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PLAY OF THE YOUNG CHILD AND DAY CARE WORKERS: A PIAGET JUSTIFICATION

by

Thomas Daniels Yawkey, Ph.D.
The University of Wisconsin-Madison
Child and Family Studies
Early Childhood Education Division

No part of this manuscript may be reproduced in any manner or form without the author's expressed permission.

PS 007366

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas Daniels Yawkey
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Play of the Young Child and Day Care Workers: A Piaget Justification

The day care worker is continually and constantly surrounded by a milieu of children's spontaneous activities on a day to day basis and over long periods of time. Historically, these activities, called play or "gamesmanship", have existed before the time of Plato. However, the importance of play and its contributions to the intellectual, social, and psychomotor and emotional growth of the child is just being recognized (Singer, 1973). Play has received so little attention not only from empirical research, but also from textbook authors. This recent awareness may be one reason why day care teachers are asked time and time again to justify play and games as a viable part and connected subset of curricula.

> In reporting on all the various pressures that have now become the constant, day-by-day facts of life in every . . . school, what we begin to see emerging is an important distinction: . . . schools may be "in", but play is "out"! (LeShan, 1973, p. 110)

However, this raging battle to retain play in the curriculum is not singular to day care. Kindergarten as well as some knowledgeable primary grade teachers have also been called upon to defend the importance of play as a valuable contribution to the child not only outside but also inside classrooms. In a way it is incredible to believe that play which is the main business of so much of the young child's life requires justification and rationale for its inclusion into the curriculum.

> There were and still are valid reasons for making every effort to re-establish play as a central and significant aspect of life during the preschool years, to say nothing of its meaning in the lives of all human beings of all ages. It is not to be trifled with. (LeShan, 1973, p. 110)

Given this lack of knowledge about play, justifications for inclusion of play into the day care curriculum typically fall into two types--the nondescriptive and the intuitive types. Both levels of justification have origins in a particular mainstream of psychological thought.

Types of Justification

At the nondescriptive level, the most commonly heard justifications for play are shrouded in cliches, very general comments, pat phrases, and often trite and meaningless statements as to its worth and relative merits. Some of these pat and most often heard phrases used in defense of play are: (1) "it creates an awareness of individual and peer relations"; (2) "it develops creativity and imagination"; (3) "it is fun and enjoyable to do"; (4) "it serves recreational purposes"; (5) "it is the 'right' of the four year old child"; (6) "it contributes to intellectual growth"; (7) "it builds large and small muscles"; (8) "it is learning to learn"; (9) "it is the child's work"; and many, many more. The source of this justification at the nondescriptive level is mainly introspection. By examining early childhood memories of play, adults and teachers of young children can and have built support for play based upon subjective feelings, observations,

and recollections of what did seem pleasurable. Justification built at the nondescriptive level for support for play in day care centers is purely personal, variable, and often times quite circular. Just as childhood experiences and opportunities for play vary across children, so the arguments for support of play at this level of justification varies across adults, teachers, and other members of the community.

At the level of intuition, a more sophisticated level, gained after years of involvement with young children, other justifications for inclusion of play in day care curriculum are offered. These include:

1. Spontaneous activities of the children are significant. They give meaning to a child's life and perhaps for future life.
2. These activities are important because they represent an emotional release and are in reality safety valves for young children to blow off excess energy in socially approved ways.
3. They are of interest to the child and therefore acceptable . . . . It is the thing to do with the limitation of physical harm to a child and/or other children.
4. Spontaneous activities assist the children's development of large and small muscles.
5. Play is synonomous with day care and are time fillers--for what else could the"little people" do.
6. Based upon our typical Western academic tradition of thought, inherited from and transmitted to us from the Greco-Roman cultures, children develop both their minds and bodies from play.

7. From play and games, children develop their intellectual functions of thinking, reasoning, problem solving, and imagining.
8. Through play, children learn how to play, cooperate, interact, and react in groups.
9. Going through solitary, parallel, and social play, the significant developmental stage for the growth processes are important for later life.

Whether at the nondescriptive or intuitive levels, the reasons advanced for the inclusion of play, if examined closely, lack clarity, use a bandwagon effect for persuasion, and offer little convincing support to the gatekeepers of the center and school--the decision makers. These statements also rarely convince large segments of the community who also support the center or school. These justifications reflect the ideas of the early childhood era analogous with folklore suggested by the titles, "The Magic Years" or "The Child's Inherent Right to be Three". Yet, marshalling support for play in day care at nondescriptive and intuitive levels are important, and should be retained. The justifications do help somewhat to support the inclusion of play in curriculum. However, the important question of ". . . why children and/or people play . . . " is still largely unanswered . . . and the question goes on being asked and asked . . . !

Much of the trite, pat, and intuitively-based reasons advanced for the support of spontaneous activities of young children can for the most part be categorized by a feeling that growth and development is an unfolding process that continues to blossom as the children advance in age. This

view of the "natural unfolding" supports play of young children as an expression of personal feelings, and emotions, conscious and unconscious. From a theory point of view, the importance of play has been justified largely at the nondescriptive and intuitive levels from a maturational point of view. Specifically, psychoanalytic or Freudian theory serving as a foundation for play, not only based its assumptions upon but were also derived from observations of disturbed children, traumatic dreams of various adults, and Little Hans--who Freud hardly observed at all . . . so history records.

Characteristic of the maturational view is an awareness that children engage in motor play (based upon running, hopping, galloping, climbing, etc.), intellectual play (founded upon curiosity, imagination, etc.), emotional play (based upon the differentiation and integration of personality factors such as noncompliance) or sensorial experiences (related to auditory, visual, kinesthetic-tactile, and other senses). Categorizations such as those described are content classifications of play and games. The behavior that children display in play are grouped into various units of behavior which puts them into action. For example, because the actions of running, hopping, galloping, etc., require motor movements--this form of play becomes motor play. This classification can be further grouped into large motor play juxtaposed to small motor play categorized by actions of cutting, pasting, tearing, etc.--all of which use fine motor actions. Categorization of play by function or content is quite variable and depends upon the amount or equality of the content displayed by a child in play at

any one time. For example, intellectual play can become social, emotional play, or sensorial experiences depending upon the amount of intellectual compared to social, emotional, or sensorial behavior employed in the actions. Using content groupings, others are: science play, water play, sand-table play, woodworking play, and on and on . . . .

Although this variability in classifying play and games is multi-polar, categorization by content just like rational for play based upon nondescriptive and intuitive explanations are at times quite usual and very useful. Day care teachers use content classifications as a way of insuring varied curriculum experiences, providing a balance in the center's curriculum, as an easy means to communicate, identify, and describe what the children are doing at any one time.

The main drawback to identifying play by content categories and for that matter to justifying play in day care using nondescriptive and intuitive levels is variability, broadness, lack of communication, and misinterpretation. Essentially, actions grouped by function not only lack precision, but also depends upon whether the adult is operating at nondescriptive or intuitive levels of justification. Content categories most seriously break down when children at play engage in symbolism and social roles based upon verbal expressions of thought. This problem of classification can be solved by grouping and labeling these actions into social play or through further content subdivisions--dramatic play and socio-dramatic play. However, these classifications show the same problems of all other play classified by content--great variability between and among adults and

variability from moment to moment. Then, too, although content classifications are variable they are also specific. That is, play is specific to a function of actions that, at least from a maturational point of view, sees play as a response to unconscious conflict, deprivation, or the need for gaining mastery over the environment.

However, day care teachers are hard put to explain all forms of play in this manner. An alternative to viewing and justifying play at non-descriptive and intuitive levels using maturational feelings of unfolding processes, is that suggested by Professor Jean Piaget of the University of Geneva, Switzerland.

Piaget's View of Play

A more thoroughly constructed theory of the origins and development of play in children was devised by Piaget. Its frame of reference is clearly centered upon a cognitive processing system (Piaget, 1962). For Piaget, mental structures or schemes of the young child develop in and through a heirarchically organized sequence of invariant stages. These stages are qualitatively different from one another. The difference within and between these cognitive stages of intellectual development are basically qualitative in origin and refer to key characteristics of thinking or knowing indicative of human organisms from birth through 16 years of age or older. According to Piaget, play is an integral part of the development of thinking and knowing. Although recognizing the importance of social and emotional growth, Piaget neither excludes nor denies the existence of these growth processes as some critics have charged. Instead, Piaget argues that both

00009

social and emotional development contain large segments which are purely cognitive in origin and composition. Human development, then, for Piaget is viewed through the growth of thinking processes. Like social and emotional growth, the focus of play is primarily seen as the development of thought structures. For Piaget, play, part of the structural thinking process, evolves from working out two fundamental characteristics of his or her modes of experiencing or adapting. These modes or adaptive actions are assimilative and accommodative. Piaget also uses the terms assimilation and accommodation in a broader sense to apply to intellectual development.

Assimilation is a theoretical construct which "represents an attempt [by the child] to imitate the interact physically with the environment" (Singer, 1975, p. 13). Said differently, assimilation is a process in which the human organism changes the information it receives in the process of making the data part of the individual's know-how. As information is received from the environment, the child tries to make it a part of her or him. In a word, information is digested. Accommodation is also a construct and "represents the attempt [by the child] to integrate externally derived percepts or motor actions into a limited number of schemes or differentiated motor and cognitive skills available at a particular age." (Singer, 1973, p. 13) Accommodation is a process of adjustment, the human organism must make to the external environment in order to assimilate the information. Put succinctly, as the child begins taking in environmental information and making it a part of him or her, the child's mental structures

undergo transformations in and through this digestion.

According to Piaget, intellectual development is the active interplay between the twin complimentary processes of assimilation and accommodation. When the two processes balance each other, referred to as equilibrium, intellectual adaptation occurs. When the twin complimentary processes are not in balance, adjustment to the object, accommodation, may predominate over assimilation. This results in imitation or mastery play. When fitting the impression in with previous experiences and then adapting it to the requirements of the human organism, assimilation predominates. The end result, here, is ludic symbolism, make believe, or symbolic play.

Mastery play or imitation according to Piaget clearly involves a child's attempt to accommodate to the environment by taking in exact amounts of stimuli from a particular object or situation. In mastery play, the child accepts the limitation of the environment imposed by the object or situation being accommodated. Here, the child repeats an activity to master it. Symbolic play or pure assimilation, a compliment of the adaptive process, involves taking in information without accepting the limitations of accommodating to the stimuli in the environment. Here, the child repeats an activity to understand it. Thus, symbolic play is a way of practicing what the child has already met and come to know. In symbolic play, a child repeats words and sentences, that were overheard and repeats actions that were observed. Time and time again, these actions in symbolic play are repeated, but here the frame of reference is idiocratic, limited, and

09011

rather narrow. In mastery play, the child grasps, and explores an object or situation by picking it up, pushing, pounding, or perhaps rolling it and the adaptive responses are limited to and specifically reflected by the object or situation modeled.

However, much of the child's play is assimilative in nature and viewed in a wider context--as part of assimilative actions with a limited range of cognitive schemes. As the child receives additional opportunities of involvement with objects and situations, the child's schemes become more and more differentiated, the product of assimilation appears more realistic and takes on less and less of the original and unique play qualities. As the product of assimilation becomes more realistic, the child's play loses its particular idiocratic qualities and becomes more and more "ordinary".

Piaget sees no need to assume that play has special instincts or innate impulses that unfold at critical times since he regards play as a product of assimilation-repetitions of achievement to fit them in, consolidate and organize them in order to know them. Concerns of and questions about emotion, social development, motivation, learning to learn, the child's right to be three and other points of view of and adult feelings about play are all related and no longer totally separate and isolated from each other. With the assumption of assimilation as play two collaries logically follow. The first collary is that the child will play at whatever activity she or he has just acquired. The second collary follows. As the child is playing, the activity will be characterized by deviations

and distortions of reality to suit his or her requirements, individual and situational. In both collaries, reality is adapted to the child's own requirements and needs relative to repeating actions already mastered.

Piaget's theory provides play with a biological function of "active repetition and experimentation which mentally digests novel situations and experiences." (Millar, 1971, p. 56). His view of play is coherent and describes the growth of invariant and successive play activities from throwing a rattler through make believe (. . . as if . . .) and acting out dramas to playing checkers. Essentially, these successive play activities, classified into stages, are characteristic of qualitatively distinct thought structures. The stage-like thinking structures, observed through and in play activities, in reality, parallel Piaget's stages of intellectual development. Just as there are stages in intellectual growth, there are also a number of stages in the development of play activities.

Classification of Piaget's Play

Tied inextricably to Piaget's beliefs concerning the evolution and development of thought structures of human organisms, content classifications of play are neither stressed nor used. Piaget refuses to view play as or to group play activities by content categories because of their extreme variability across time and place, and because categorization by content of necessity depends upon preconceived notions of attributes comprising categories. Classification of play, for Piaget, must serve as logical

06013

explanations of activities without assuming definitions á priori. Instead, Piaget insists that classification of play must be confined to the analysis of thinking structures present in play and to degrees of mental complexity evidenced from play activities. For developmental theory, play activities range from primitive sensorimotor to highly complex social games which are categorized into stages corresponding to levels of intellectual development. These stages are: (1) sensorimotor practice/play; (2) symbolic play; and (3) play activities with rules. Constructive and creative play as a transitional level is also included within Piaget's classification system.

Practice Play

Sensorimotor practice play or function games, characterized by prelanguage, evolve from the repetition of actions as soon as these become mastered. Developmentally speaking, they arise and first appear during substages, two through five, of the sensorimotor stage of intellectual development. Sensorimotor schemes acquired by the child during the first 18 months give rise to functional assimilation. Practice play, viewed as mere excercise, puts into action a group of varied behaviors without modification of thinking structures. The sole purpose of sensorimotor practice play is pleasure of function--i.e., "pleasure in being a cause" or "functional pleasure". For instance, the young child having learned to find toys or other objects under a pillow will remove pillow after pillow from sofas and

chairs because this action itself is fun to do, enjoyable, and pleasurable. In another example, an older child, who previously acquired the action of jumping over a stream, now jumps back and forth across the stream again and again because it is pleasurable. Both of these examples of sensorimotor practice play are not repeated out of necessity to acquire new actions or behaviors. The child's purpose is solely the pleasure derived from "removing pillows", or "from jumping". The repetition, that was required to successfully acquire the action, becomes sensorimotor practice, or play activities repeated with variations. In practice play, neither symbols, make believe, nor group rules are used. The situation which puts the schemes into action, provides reason alone for the repetition of that action.

Functional assimilation or "practice for the sake of practice", accompanied by pleasure of "being the cause" or "feeling the power", are not only characteristic of the sensorimotor period of intelligence, but also are found whenever new skills are acquired. Practice play, then, can occur at age 2 1/2, 3, 6, and so on--whenever a child acquires new skills or finds objects and uses the skill or object primarily for fun. Adults practice play with newly purchased houses or cars, for example. These objects, at first, are used just for fun or the pleasure they provide at "being the cause". Likewise, day care teachers and professors demonstrate practice play, for instance, when new positions are acquired and then employed solely for the fun of the individual's new position. The frequency

of sensorimotor practice play, however, decreases as time increases after the individual's acquisition of language.

Whether throwing, pulling, filling, emptying, breaking down objects and putting them together, or driving a new car, if the action already mastered is then employed for functional practice and pleasure derived from that action, the individual is engaged in practice play. At the final or 6th stage of the sensorimotor stage of intellectual development, parallel with the acquisition of language, symbolic play originates and develops.

Symbolic Play

For Piaget, symbolic play demonstrates characteristics of qualitative thought processes reflective of the stage of verbal and intuitive thought of the concrete stage of intellectual development (2 through 7/8 years of age). Symbolic in contrast to practice play, implies actions in the absense of objects--i.e., representation of an object that is not presently observed (Piaget, 1962). The child in symbolic play compares a given object and its imagined referent and through the comparison assimilation is distorted. For Piaget, representation begins when actions, first acquired, are taken out of context and again reproduced at the sight of the original object and then are reproduced in the content of other objects. Put differently, images or symbols result from body adjustments to an object in its absence. The image evolves but without complete overt movement as in the original occurrence used to establish it. "Initially, these

interiorizations stand for the object, as concrete symbols. and later they act as signs indicating or signifying the object." (Millar, 1971, p. 55). Language, a socially derived and readily available set of signifiers based on words, assists this process. However, language is not essential to it.

A child, having acquired driving schemas in the context of helping mother drive her car, reproduces these actions out of context in a play activity at the sight of the mother's car (the original referent), and then reproduces these same driving actions at the sight of a miniature toy truck and other objects. With symbolic play, symbolization, pretense, and make believe are possible.

From a developmental point of view, Piaget sees the evolution of representation originating in sensorimotor practice play, then proceeding heirarchically to symbol in action without representation and finally to symbol in action with representation. Piaget feels the symbol subordinates but does not replace sensorimotor practice actions in the symbolic play.

Symbolic or imaginative play involving the make believe or the element, ". . . as if . . . ", are readily used. However symbolic play, like practice play, is purely assimilative. Repetition and organization of thought in terms of symbols and images already mastered are operationalized through imaginative play. Symbolic play also serves to assimilate and at the same time consolidate emotional thought structures of the child's experience. The child reproduces anything and everything of importance in symbolic play, although the reproduction itself, is a distortion of reality

00017

since the child makes no effort to adapt his or her actions to environmental milieu.

Symbolic play is highly idiosyncratic because it originates within the child's egocentric thinking processes of a particular intellectual stage, is based upon specific images and symbols that the individual uses, and upon particular experiences she or he has had. As the child continues to engage in symbolic play, gaining further experiences from the environment, it becomes well organized and progressively more elaborated. With continued elaboration of symbolic play, thinking structures are modified and expanded. As a result of this process, imaginative play takes on more and more realism and the child's actions slowly begin to match reality. The individual begins to make efforts at adaptive responses through highly complex symbolic play. In parallel fashion, the child displays greater socially adaptive responses, which inevitably require less and less distortion of reality, and subsequently decrease the use of imaginative substitutes for symbols.

Play Activities with Rules

Play activities with rules reflect thinking structures in abstract form and represent high levels of operational intelligence characteristic of the children's intellectual development from ages 7 through 11/12 and upward. While sensorimotor practice and symbolic play decrease as the

individual acquires more experiences and gets older, after age 11 or 12 play activities with rules remain and develop throughout life. The use of play activities with rules in adults can be observed in card games such as poker, sport activities, and games for example, checkers, chess, and many others. Individual and highly subjective symbols characterizing imaginative play, have become modified through collective organization of individual activities and by cooperation with others. In a word, they are ludic activities of socialized beings.

In games with rules, children acquire spontaneous regularity--i.e., throwing from the same spot, batting from the same spot, kicking from the same line. These play activities of socialized beings also reflect interiorized notions of obligation that have been acquired through assimilative actions within a particular group. Consistent with Piaget's ideas of spontaneous regularity and obligation, individuals may give themselves the "game-plan" or the rule based upon knowing and having interiorized other rules. Violations of play activities with rules also carry sanctions of a collective complete with "warnings" and in a more extreme form "exclusion" or "expulsion" from the group game. These rules have not been borrowed from statutes of an athletic association, nor do they represent compilations of legal documents, but have been designed and tailor-made for a purpose and fit a specific play activity. As might be expected, thinking structures and symbols employed in play activities with rules become more logical and show greater objectivity.

Play activities with rules, like symbolic play, contain some motor elements of sensorimotor practice. These motor elements are readily observable in all play activities with rules such as games of marbles, competitive games, etc. However, codes of honor, built upon collective organization of ludic activities, have replaced the imaginative play of the child. For Piaget, play activities with rules are still characterized by assimilative responses rather than adaptive actions. Games with rules are not equivalent to intellectual adaptation to reality because they serve essentially to legitimize the child's satisfaction with his or her previous achievements (Piaget, 1962).

Sensorimotor practice play, symbolic games, and play activities with rules evolve and develop in successive and heirarchical fashion. There is another level of play discussed by Piaget. It is neither successive nor heirarchical but is regarded as a transitional level.

Constructive and Creative Play

Piaget recognizes another classification of play activity he calls constructive and creative play. From a developmental view, this play provides a transition from assimilative to more adaptive actions and can occur at any time or any age level (Piaget, 1962). Piaget (1962) argues that these play activities do not constitute a stage in and of themselves. Instead, these play activities demonstrate internal transformations of symbolic representation toward adaptive representation. As a transitional

00020

category, Piaget sees construction and creative play fitting in between sensorimotor and symbolic play and also " . . . between the two and adaptive activity . . . which is at the same time practical and representational"(Piaget, 1962, p. 109).

For instance, when a child, instead of using a unit block to represent a car, but really makes a car from wooden and metal materials, symbolic play emerges into real imitation as the final product is completed. In another example, building a house with actual bricks and blocks involves sensorimotor practice and symbolic play, but the final completed product--the real house--required spontaneous intelligent activity and in a strict developmental sense cannot be classified as play. The actions the child used to build the house or car and complete the final products in these examples required spontaneous adaptive actions not purely assimilative responses characteristic of sensorimotor, symbolic, or play activities with rules.

For Piaget, the child in these examples, transcended the realms of sensorimotor practice, symbolic play, and play activities with rules for that of imitation and work. Constructive and creative play occupy a position between play and intelligent work or between play and imitation. These transitional and adaptive actions, called "occupations", are the boundary class between play and non-play activities. Essentially, they provide the continuity between the child's play and the child's work.

Prologue

Coupled with justifications at nondescriptive and intuitive levels, research from Piaget's developmental theory can be employed and used to support play as a viable part of day care curriculum. The rationale for play taken from developmental theory has a number of strengths and advantages that nondescriptive and intuitively-based arguments lack.

1. Play and playing is put into context of evolving and developing thought structures of human organisms.
2. Play is a natural yet developmental phenomena reflective of all human organisms from the infant, to the adolescent, and to the adult.
3. The categories, used to group play and play activities, are based upon qualitative characteristics of evolving thought structures used in the playing process.
4. Observations of children at play can be used to determine the levels of intellectual development--sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete, or formal operations.
5. Play, like thought structures, is initially dependent upon the child's action and manipulation of concrete materials for maximum benefit and potential.
6. Play, like adaptive actions, is based upon an interactive effect of the child acting and being acted upon by the environment but varies from intellectually adaptive actions in degree of assimilative

to accommodative actions and reactions made by the child.

7. Play serves to facilitate and provides a firm foundation for the growth of logical thought structures.
8. Play assists all the growth processes--intellectual, social, psychomotor, as well as emotional through structuring and restructuring of large cognitive components that comprise each of these developmental processes.
9. The relationship between play and work depends upon the qualitativeness of assimilative to spontaneously adaptive intellectual actions.
10. Practice or excercise play is viewed as assimilative actions that are repeated for the pleasure they yield in "being the cause".
11. Symbolic play involves make believe and imagination, is a result of distorting assimilation, is idiocyrantic, and serves a particular child and groups of children.
12. Play activities with rules differ from and cannot be included within symbolic play because the former is a product of particular collective social groups while the later is child specific.
13. Constructive and creative play is viewed as a boundary or transitional class of play because of intellectual or adaptive actions used and acquired by the child.

There are a number of difficulties inherent in the Piagetian view of play and for that matter the developmental theory of intellectual growth.

09023

Particularly, more information and research evidence is needed in terms of the growth of logical thought structures and in further investigating assimilative and accommodative actions and reactions acquired and elicited by human organisms. However, the Piagetian rationale for the importance of play as a viable part of day care curriculum can still be used independently or in conjunction with nondescriptive or intuitive justifications pending more research evidence.

00024

References

LeShar, E. The conspiracy against childhood. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Millar, S. The psychology of play. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1971.

Piaget, J. Play, dreams, and imitation. New York: W W. Norton and Company, 1962.

Singer, J. The child's world of make-believe. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

00025